







Stanley R. Miska

Serial No:

09/822,113

Filed:

March 30, 2001

For:

FLAME RETARDANT CORROSIVE RESISTANT CONDUCTIVE FABRIC ARTICLE AND METHOD

Examining Attorney:

Arti Singh

Art Unit:

1771

TC 1700 MAIL ROOM

Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated March 6, 2003, Applicant elects to proceed with claims 1-17 but traverses the restriction requirement.

It is the Examiner's position that inventions II and I are related as a process of making and product made but that they are distinct because the flame retardant coating could be applied by means of a heated spray coating and could still formulate the same article.

Respectively, neither claim 18 nor claim 19 is limited to any particular method of applying the flame retardant coating, and therefore the Examiner's suggestion that applying the flame retardant coating by means of a heated spray coating is a different method from the method claimed in claims 18 or 19, is not well founded.

Applicant acknowledges that claim 20 recites a vapor depositing the conductive metal, but the Examiner makes no argument with respect to applying the conductive metal, the argument being limited to applying the flame retardant coating as a heated spray coating, and as to this even claim 19 would include the Examiner's suggested method of making. Accordingly, the Examiner has not shown that another can make the products and materially different process because the proposed process is not only not materially different it is not different at all from the process as claimed. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are requested.

Dated: March 13, 2003

Harter, Secrest & Emery LLP 1600 Baush & Lomb Place Rochester, New York 14604-2711

Tel: (585) 232-6500 Fax: (585) 232-2152 Respectfully submitted,

Stephen B. Salai, Esq. Registration No. 26,900 Attorney for Applicant

MEDIG (37 C.F.R. §1.8(a))